

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the above amendments, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24 and 26-45 were pending.

In this Amendment, as noted above, claims 1, 2, 9-13, 20-22, 24, 29 and 39-43 have been amended, claims 30-38, 44 and 45 have been canceled, and claims 46-48 have been added. Thus, after entry of these amendments, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24, 26-29, 39-43 and 46-48 are pending in the present application.

Additionally, these amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. *See, e.g.* Specification, page 9, paragraph 0027, lines 4-14; pages 6-7, paragraph 0023, lines 10-12; page 9, paragraph 0029, lines 7-11 and Fig. 4, action 406; page 7, paragraph 0024; and page 14, paragraph 0038. Further, please note that the amendments to claims 2, 9, 11, 13, 20, 22, 24 and 39-43 were made to conform with amendments to the corresponding language in their respective independent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application based on the following remarks.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 102(b) - Kolev

Claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-24, 29, 30, 34 and 39-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,283 to Kolev et al. (hereinafter, “Kolev”).

As noted above, claims 30, 34, 44 and 45 have been canceled, and thus this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as Kolev does not recite each and every element recited by the present claims.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131 (*citing Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Id.* (*citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, “the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant’s claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.” *In re Paulsen*, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

PATENT

With respect to independent claim 1, Kolev does not disclose or suggest a method including, at least,

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks; and
originating the call on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks

With respect to independent claim 10, Kolev does not disclose or suggest a method including, at least,

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks; and
preventing the call from being originated on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks.

With respect to independent claim 12, Kolev does not disclose or suggest a computer readable media embodying a program of instructions executable by a processor to perform a method of communications, the method including, at least,

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or not allowed on each of the identified communications networks; and
originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks, and preventing the call from being originated if the call is determined not to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks.

With respect to independent claim 21, Kolev does not disclose or suggest a communications device including, at least,

a processor configured to: ...

access, for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and compare the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or not allowed on each of the identified communications networks;

originate the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the processor determines that the call is allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks; and

prevent the call from being originated over the respective one of the plurality of communications network if the processor determines that the call is not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks.

With respect to independent claim 29, Kolev does not disclose or suggest a communications device including, at least,

means for accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or not allowed on each of the identified communications networks;

means for originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks; and

means for preventing the call over the respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call is determined not be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks.

In contrast to the recited subject matter, which bases originating and/or preventing a call on determining if a *call is allowed or not allowed according to a comparison of the dialing string to user-defined permission information for each of a plurality of communication networks supported by a communication device*, Kolev is instead concerned with “allowing the greatest possible service availability when the subscriber identity in at least one of the network modes is invalid.” Kolev, Abstract, lines 4-6. There is no mention or hint by Kolev that it would be desirable to determine if a call is allowed or not allowed according to user-defined permission information. As such, Kolev is silent with respect to the recited subject matter. Thus, Kolev fails to disclose each and every element recited by independent claims 1, 10, 12, 21 and 29.

Claims 2-4, 9, 11, 13-15, 20, 22-24, and 39-43 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 10, 12, or 21, and thus are not anticipated by Kolev for at least the

same reasons. Further, each of these dependent claims separately recites subject matter not disclosed or suggested by Kolev.

For example, referring to claims 39-43, Kolev is silent with respect to the recited subject matter of “wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of an allowed phone number or a blocked phone number.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-24, 29, 30, 34 and 39-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kolev.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 103(a) - Kolev and Jonsson

Claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125,283 to Jonsson (hereinafter, “Jonsson”).

As noted above, claims 31, 32, 36 and 37 have been canceled, and thus this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as any combination of Kolev and Jonsson fails to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter. In particular, claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 26 and 27 respectively depend from one of independent claims 1, 12 or 21, which are believed to be patentable over Kolev as noted above. Further, Jonsson fails to address the above-noted failures of Kolev. Thus, claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 26 and 27 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.¹ Further, each of these claims separately recites subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of Jonsson.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 103(a) - Kolev, Jonsson and Sakai

¹ MPEP 2143.03.

PATENT

Claims 8, 19, 28, 33 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of Jonsson in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,010,296 to Sakai et al. (hereinafter, “Sakai”).

As noted above, claims 33 and 38 have been canceled, and thus this rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as any combination of Kolev, Jonsson and Sakai fails to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter. In particular, claims 8, 19 and 28 respectively depend from one of independent claims 1, 12 or 21, which are believed to be patentable over Kolev and Jonsson as noted above. Further, Sakai fails to address the above-noted failures of Kolev and Jonsson. Thus, claims 8, 19 and 28 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.² Further, each of these claims separately recites subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 19, 28, 33 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of Jonsson in further view of Sakai.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 46-48 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled. As noted above, these new claims are fully supported throughout the Specification.

Additionally, claims 46-48 are allowable, as there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests the subject matter recited by these claims.

In particular, claims 46-48 respectively depend from one of independent claims 1, 10 and 21, which are believed to be patentable over any combination of the cited references, as discussed above. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 46-48 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.³

Further, each of these claims separately recites subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references.

² MPEP 2143.03.

³ MPEP 2143.03.

For example, there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests a method including, at least,

identifying compatible networks from the plurality of communications networks based upon the parameters, wherein the parameters further include a service parameter;

wherein the accessing further comprises accessing only for respective compatible networks from the plurality of communications networks,

as recited by claims 46 and 47.

Similarly, for example, there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests a device including, at least,

wherein the processor is further configured to identify compatible networks from the plurality of communications networks based upon the parameters, wherein the parameters further include a service parameter, and wherein the processor is further configured to access the user-defined permission information and compare the dialing string to the user-defined permission information only for respective compatible networks from the plurality of communications networks.

as recited by claim 48.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claims 46-48.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 19, 2008

By: /Kristine U. Ekwueme/
Kristine Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344
(858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502